

PDRSF
21.2-2
1/23/09

RE: Clarification on EPA request for stormline information
Applegate, Rick
to:
Chip Humphrey
01/23/2009 09:27 AM
Show Details



History: This message has been forwarded.

Thanks, Chip. I think this looks fine with one exception. I think category C should include only those known to have infiltration. "Suspected" is subjective and prone to mischaracterization. We don't want to overstate the areas of infiltration when part of what we are trying to figure out is whether we have a clear stormline picture. If entities want to suggest at a later date that theirs is one where infiltration occurs, they could provide a bit of information to justify that classification.

You might also want to note that we tried to develop this streamlined approach in order to allow for its incorporation on the tight RI schedule.

And I agree that this should come to me and I will forward it on to the management team. Thanks again for the chance to work through this.

-----Original Message-----

From: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2009 9:00 AM
To: Applegate, Rick
Subject: Fw: Clarification on EPA request for stormline information

Rick/Dawn

See Kristine's proposal below to add a fourth category - let us know if this works and we'll get it sent out. Also - should we send to Rick as clarification or to LWG mgrs (Bob, Jim, Rick)?

Chip

----- Forwarded by Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US on 01/23/2009 08:52 AM

Kristine
Koch/R10/USEPA/U
S
01/23/2009 08:09
AM

To
humphrey.chip@epamail.epa.gov
cc

Subject
Fw: Clarification on EPA request
for stormline information

Chip, In reviewing Dawn's writeup, I think that there should be 4 shaded areas, rather than 3. See my proposed changes, below. You might want to run this past Rick/Dawn to see if they are on board, first.

Rick,

EPA has prepared the following clarifications of EPA comment 106 on Section 5.1.3.1.1 of the Round 2 Report. We discussed the following approach with the City and agreed to the following to meet EPA objectives for conceptual site model in the draft RI report.

1. Only show current knowledge of stormline piping and sites connected (i.e., outfall drainage basins) for the large shared conveyance systems in the Harbor; this includes systems discharging through City, Port, and Schnitzer-International Slip outfalls. However, do not show catch basins, manholes, and other such details.
2. Show a map that has the following shadings:
 - A) Areas drained by shared conveyances (as identified in #1 above)
 - B) Areas with direct discharge (either through outfalls or sheet flow)
 - C) Areas known/suspected to have no storm water discharge (i.e., site where there is specific information that the site/area only has infiltration and no ability to discharge stormwater - e.g., PGE-Harbor that has a berm around it so no stormwater runoff occurs).
 - D) Areas with uncertain drainage (assume it will be everything not included in A, B, and C above).

Kristine Koch
Remedial Project Manager
USEPA, Office of Environmental Cleanup

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900, M/S ECL-115
Seattle, Washington 98101-3140

(206)553-6705

(206)553-0124 (fax)

1-800-424-4372 extension 6705 (M-F, 8-4 Pacific Time, only)

----- Forwarded by Kristine Koch/R10/USEPA/US on 01/23/2009 07:58 AM

"Sanders, Dawn"
<DAWNS@BES.CI.PO
RTLAND.OR.US>

01/22/2009 10:42
AM

Kristine Koch/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

To

cc

"Applegate, Rick"
<RICKA@BES.CI.PORTLAND.OR.US>,
Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject
Clarification on EPA request for
stormline information

Kristine,

I believe that our discussion was a clarification of EPA comment 106 on Section 5.1.3.1.1 of the Round 2 Report (but check me on this). We discussed the following approach to meet EPA objectives.

1. Show stormline piping for the 3 large shared conveyance systems in the

Harbor - this includes systems discharging through City, Port, and Schnitzer-International Slip outfalls.

2. Show a map that has the following 3 shadings:

- A) Areas drained by shared conveyances (as identified in #1 above)
- B) Areas with direct discharge (either through outfalls or sheet flow)
- C) Areas with uncertain drainage (assume it will be everything not included in A and B above) unless there is specific information that the site/area only has infiltration and no ability to discharge stormwater [I added this in thinking about sites such as PGE-Harborton that has a berm around it so no stormwater runoff occurs]

Hope this helps, (b) (6)

Dawn Sanders
City of Portland

BES Superfund Program
503.823.7263